

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,934	01/22/2002	Lin Guo	3123-412	4865
7	590 03/26/2004		EXAMINER	
MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP			BURCH, MELODY M	
SUITE 411 3151 SOUTH VAUGHN WAY		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
AURORA, CO	80014		3683 DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/053,934	GUO ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Melody M. Burch	3683	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 15 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applicants avoid abandonment of this application app	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da			tata a tata a ta
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period	e later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE e date on which the petition under 37 CF	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appr	on. See MPEP opriate extension
fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date o (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	f the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the mai CFR 1.704(b).	originally set in the final ling date of the final reje	Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 	•		·
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) $oxed{oxed}$ they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c)	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: <u>see number 5</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	d be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmer explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-13,15-20,22,23,32-45,53-55 and	<u>d 59</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 14,21,24,2	25,27-31,46-52 and 56-58.		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the inclusion of the limitation of the push-pin assembly specifically being "of the servo writer" and the inclusion of the limitation of moving the push-pin assembly relative to the first disk specifically while the actuator arm facing surface of the push-pin assembly is engaged with the disk drive actuator arm assembly raise new issues in the claims that require further consideration.

7nmj3 3/23/04

> MATTHEW C. GRAHAM PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 310

Th. L. 8/23/2004